

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,039	07/19/2001	Jarmo Makinen	59643.00128	8466
	7590 07/16/200 DERS & DEMPSEY L	·	EXAMINER	
14TH FLOOR			DANIEL JR, WILLIE J	
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/909,039	MAKINEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Willie J. Daniel, Jr.	2617	,

	Willie J. Daniel, Jr.	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ado	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).in compliance time periods:	ring replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final reject	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70		E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1		
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set that in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	inally set in the final Off	ice action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further contains.</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet</li> </ul>		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a €	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,00,00	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-</li> </ol>	will not be entered, or b)    will will will will will will will w	ill be entered and an	explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 12-30 and 33-37.			
Claim(s) objected to:	·		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>31 and 32</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence	ot be entered s necessary and
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:	Chara I		
	CHARLES N. APPIA	 H	
	SUPERVISORY PATENT EX		

ENVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed 27 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the comments in this section and Final Action mailed on 28 March 2007).
- 2. In response to applicant's argument of claims 31-32 on pg. 15, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, "...page 10, lines 23-32...fully supports the feature computer readable medium...at existing receivers and transmitters...", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant further argues on pg. 15, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, "...many existing receivers and transmitters include a computer-readable medium...", however, does this mean that existing receivers and transmitters include the claimed features? As indicated in item 4 of the Final action, there is a lack of clarity as to what constitutes the medium. The claim(s) include(s) a limitation (e.g., new matter) that is not supported by the instant application as originally filed. The applicant is advised to review the subject matter of the specification (see pg. 5, lines 8-11,21-22,25-27; pg. 8, lines 11-16), which at best appears to be describing the claimed computer-readable medium as a signal that is exchanged between the receiver and transmitter. Furthemore, the specification does not convey as to whether the medium can be a component such as a storage device, ROM, RAM, or Flash memory that hosts (i.e., tangibly embody) a computer program. Consequently, there is no language in the specification that describes the limitation(s) as recited in said claims. Applicant is advised to clearly and concisely provide claim language that is consistent and correlates to the specification and mindful not to improperly utilized language that is clearly not supported. The Examiner respectfully requests the applicant to provide page(s), line(s), and figure(s) of the instant application that supports the limitation of the claim(s) and/or any supportive comment(s) to help clarify and resolve this issue(s).